



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/495,799	02/01/2000	Christiah A. Gilmore	1999-0225	5305

7590 08/13/2003

Samuel H Dworetsky
AT&T Corp
P O Box 4110
Middletown, NJ 07748-4110

EXAMINER

MAHMOUDI, HASSAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2175

DATE MAILED: 08/13/2003

2

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/495,799

Applicant(s)

GILMORE ET AL.

Examiner

Tony Mahmoudi

Art Unit

2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DOV POPOVICI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

2. Claims 1-3 and 5-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Brownell (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0169980.)

As to claim 1, Brownell teaches a method of providing access (see Abstract) to a server inside a firewall (see figure 3; page 1, paragraph 1; and see pages 6-7, paragraph 77) comprising the steps of:

receiving at a first proxy outside the firewall a connection request from a client (see page 5, paragraph 62);

authenticating the client (see page 6, paragraph 68);

establishing a connection between a second proxy inside the firewall and the client page wherein the second proxy forwards requests from the client to the server inside the firewall (see page 8, paragraphs 91-92.)

As to claim 2, Brownell teaches the method further comprising the step of receiving a requested resource at the second proxy from the server inside the firewall (see page 7, paragraphs 77-78) and using the established connection between the second proxy and the client to forward the requested resource to the client (see figure 3; page 4, paragraph 50, where “requested resource” is read on “web page”, and see pages 8-9, paragraphs 100-102.)

As to claim 3, Brownell teaches wherein the resource is a document containing hyperlinks to other resources (see page 4, paragraph 50, where “document containing hyperlinks to other resources” is read on “web page”.)

As to claim 5, Brownell teaches wherein the document is a Web page (see page 4, paragraph 50.)

As to claim 6, Brownell teaches wherein the connection uses a secure communication protocol (see page 4, paragraph 49; page 5, paragraphs 58, 60, and 65.)

As to claim 7, Brownell teaches wherein the secure communication protocol is SSL (see page 6, paragraph 67.)

As to claim 8, Brownell teaches wherein the client is a browser (see page 4, paragraph 50) and the server is a Web server (see page 4, paragraph 50, where “web server” is read on “servers that participate in the World Wide Web”).)

As to claim 9, Brownell teaches wherein the client is authenticated using a password mechanism (see page 6, paragraph 70, where “password” is read on “passphrase”).)

As to claim 10, Brownell teaches wherein the client is authenticated using a onetime password mechanism (see page 6, paragraph 71, where “one time password mechanism” is read on “challenge/response authentication”).)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 4 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brownell (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0169980) in view of Malcolm (U.S. patent No. 6,256,631.)

As to claim 4, Brownell teaches the second proxy (see page 8, paragraph 100, and see page 10, paragraph 120.)

Brownell does not teach translating the hyperlinks in the document into references.

Malcolm teaches a method of automatic creation of hyperlinks (see Abstract), in which he teaches translating the hyperlinks in the document into references (see column 5, lines 22-42.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Brownell to include translating the hyperlinks in the document into references.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Brownell by the teaching of Malcolm, because translating the hyperlinks in the document into references, would enable the system to generate references from hyperlinked documents, in order for the users to easily retrieve the referenced documents.

As to claim 11, Brownell teaches a method of providing a client access (see Abstract) to a resource stored behind a firewall (see figure 3; page 1, paragraph 1; and see pages 6-7, paragraph 77) comprising the steps of:

parsing the resource for hyperlinks to other resources behind the firewall (see page 4, paragraph 50, where “resources for hyperlinks” is read on “web page”); and

transmitting the resource to the client (see page 4, paragraph 50, where “resource” is read on a “web page”).)

Art Unit: 2175

Brownell does not teach rewriting the hyperlinks to point to a proxy enabled to access resources behind the firewall.

Malcolm teaches a method of automatic creation of hyperlinks (see Abstract), in which he teaches rewriting the hyperlinks to point to a proxy enabled to access resources behind the firewall (see column 5, line 60 through column 6, line 2.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Brownell to include rewriting the hyperlinks to point to a proxy enabled to access resources behind the firewall.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Brownell by the teaching of Malcolm, because rewriting the hyperlinks to point to a proxy enabled to access resources behind the firewall, would enable users to locate newly generated documents, identified by the system's re-writing of the document's hyperlinks.

As to claim 12, Brownell as modified teaches wherein the resource is a Web page (see Brownell, page 4, paragraph 50.)

As to claim 13, Brownell as modified teaches wherein the rewritten hyperlinks (see Malcolm, column 5, lines 22-42) also comprise security information (see Brownell, page 4, paragraph 49; page 5, paragraphs 58, 60, and 65.)

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following patents are cited to further show the state of art with respect to methods and systems of secure remote access to web servers in general:

Patent No.	Issued to	Cited for teaching
US Pub. No. 2002/0144128	Rahman et al.	Secure remote access and transmission method and system.
US 6,334,056	Holmes et al.	Secure remote Gateway processing.
US 6,088,796	Cianfrocca et al.	Secure middleware and querying control system.
US 6,463,418	Todd	Secure remote electronic transaction system and method.

6. Any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tony Mahmoudi whose telephone number is (703) 305-4887. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays from 08:00 am to 04:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici, can be reached at (703) 305-3830.

tm

August 1, 2003


DOV POPOVICI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100